



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PATRIOTISM AND PEACE

*By Frank Hamilton Hankins, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology,
Clark University*

I. THIS AN AGE OF NATIONALISM

The successful conclusion of the Washington conference for a reduction of armaments makes opportune an inquiry into the deeper psychic causes of war. It is obvious that reduction of naval preparedness, however valuable it may be as a primary step does not affect the fundamental causes of international hostilities. Two individuals bent on doing personal injury one to the other would not be restrained because they had no six-shooters. They might resort to clubs, knives, stones or even bare fists. Similarly, nations whose armaments are merely reduced in certain directions, but whose ratios of strength have been unaltered may not have their psychic states fundamentally altered. This is not said to decry the immense value of the Washington Conference both in its actual achievements and as a precedent, but rather to bring out the point that armaments are primarily the result, rather than the cause, of those nationalistic hopes, fears, ambitions and conflicts which lead to warlike attitudes. No nation is ever adequately armed for actual war. Every European belligerent in the Great War was, when the war began in a state of greatly reduced equipment, as compared with its condition a year later. Since the armistice numerous wars have been waged on the European continent by nations too weak to provide high-grade modern military equipment; they were in a state of reduced armament, but the wars went merrily on. The thesis developed in the following paragraphs is that the immemorial and enduring cause of war is the sentiment of group egoism, which in our day takes the form of nationalistic patriotism.

It is obvious that ours is the era of nationalism. As Israel Zangwill says: "Nationality, deep as life and narrow as the grave, is upon us." Not only are Poles, Bohemians, Slovenes, Serbs, and Bulgars stirring with a rising tide of national ambitions; not only is Ireland, smarting under exploitation, also moved by a new consciousness of individuality and strength; but the wandering Jew, after many centuries of humble self-abnegation, now dreams of a new Jerusalem and the restoration of the glories of Zion; and America grows patriotic and imperialistic and dreams of spreading her institutions of democracy and capitalism to the ends of the earth. The world is thus filled as never before since the break up of the Roman Empire with the voices of contentious nationalities at the very moment that it has begun seriously to consider the practicability of a League of Nations. War is an ancient institution whose roots antedate savagery and barbarism. But war is impossible except between groups contending for the rights of sovereignty; and yet we placed in the forefront of our aims in the recent war the guaranteeing to numerous new groups of that most fundamental test of sovereignty, the right of self-determination.

The conflict of nationalism with that degree of internationalism which is essential for peace is thus evident. We have fought to free subject peoples from the unsavory rule of hereditary potentates and thus to enlarge the opportunities of each for the expression of its peculiar national genius. And yet unless some restriction of the full rights of self-determination is effected, our commendable purpose seems destined to fill the world with a new bedlam in the coming years.

II. WHAT IS THE BASIC ELEMENT IN NATIONALISM?

1. *It is not race*

When one comes to inquire into the basis of this nationalistic particularism which thus disrupts the world he meets a puzzling problem. We commonly think of the Poles, the Bohemians, the Slovaks, and the Slovenes, and the

Belgians, the French, the Germans, and the Italians as races and satisfactorily explain their quarrels as due to race rivalry. But the anthropologists tell us that there are only three European races, that one or both of these may be a derivative from the third, and that they have all been in Europe, lo! these thousands of years. During all this time they have been fighting and conquering and intermarrying until they have all become heterogeneous hybrids divisible today into a half-dozen or more types. Proportions of ingredients may vary, but a few minutes' study of maps of racial distribution must convince any one not only that all of the most advanced western nations are very heterogeneous in blood, but that the great rivals, France, England, and Germany are composed of nearly the same elements; and that any division that can be made must leave portions of one nationality as a minority group within the geographical area subject to the self-determination of another nationality. We need not then be surprised to find Leon Dominian one of the very greatest authorities, saying, "Northern France is perhaps more Teutonic than Southern Germany, while eastern Germany is, in many places, more Slavic than Russia." Zangwill finds that Russia has nearly a dozen distinct nationalistic groups. "The fiercest fighting zone of nationality is Macedonia, and here the races so shade into one another that it was possible for the Bulgarian professors to find only seven hundred Serbians, where the Serbian statisticians found over two million and the Greek enumerators no Serbians at all." When Professor Muir finds that "the Rumanian people include a sediment of nearly every race that has passed from Asia into Europe," he does not disprove their Latinity, but rather demonstrates it. For the Italian people were already heterogeneous before the days of Roman glory; then for several centuries they incorporated the traits of many races through the untold thousands of slaves brought from the ends of the world; and for the past fifteen hundred years the valley of the Po has been a favorite rendezvous for migrating and fighting men. For such reasons Madison Grant, speaking from the viewpoint

of physical anthropology, says "there exists no such thing as a 'Latin,' a 'Celtic,' a 'German,' a 'Slavic,' or even an Aryan or Caucasian race."

This is not to say that striking race differences do not exist; but it is to say that the assumption of racial purity and solidarity is one of the illusions that have affected very profoundly the course of history. While sociologists have been pointing to racial complexity as an important and essential condition of continued progress, the chauvinists of every country have been claiming a special racial purity and superiority for their own people. This myth culminates in those other mystical doctrines of a chosen people and a racial mission which to some degree become sooner or later a part of the national tradition of every aspiring and successful people.

Moreover it seems clear that unless those elements of humanity which diverse races have in common are more numerous and fundamental than their real differences, then must wars continue until inferior races are either exterminated or brought under the dominion of benevolent despotisms. But American experience in molding to common ideals a most motley array of humankind is a harbinger of future peace among men; for it is no exaggeration to say that the diversity of races now being amalgamated in this country is as great as the entire gamut of racial differences in all Europe, if not in the entire world. But here, with freedom and security, the sentiment of nationality dissipates like exhaust steam under the blue sky.

2. It is not religion or language

It is easy in our day to show that it is not religious affiliation which is at the basis of nationality. Though an abundance of religious bigotry is still active in many countries, the major lines of religious cleavage are rather indifferent to nationalistic groupings. With certain obvious exceptions where religious differences are a partial cause of national schism, modern nations include a variety of religious sects living together in a state of mutual toleration

such as to make a religious war unthinkable. Nor by this is it intended to deny that similarity of religious beliefs is an aid in the development of a strong sentiment of nationality.

Nor is it language which is the unifying force in nationality. Welsh and Scotch are still spoken by good Britishers; the Armoricans, Basques, and Flemings of France speak their own languages but are loyal Frenchmen; nearly half of the Belgians speak only French, and most of the remainder speak only Flemish or low-German, but the devotion of all to their common king has proven truly heroic. Though the Belgians thus have two official languages, the Swiss have three and are yet able to raise an army of hundreds of thousands to defend their native land; and in America we have a perfect babel of tongues but an astonishing solidarity.

3. It is a sentiment of solidarity

And while the chief source of international anarchy is thus not race, nor religion, nor even language, neither is it group customs, nor national heroes, nor tribal totems, flags or shibboleths, though all of these may be its symbols. In fact, Professor Ramsay Muir, while calling nationality "the culmination of modern history," says also, "There is not a single infallible test of what constitutes a nation." And Arnold Toynbee corroborates him by saying that "precisely the same group of factors may produce nationality here, and there have no effect." Holland Rose calls nationality "an instinct" which "cannot be exactly defined," but yet he defines it as "a union of hearts once made, never unmade—a spiritual conception, unconquerable, indestructible." And thus we come to that mysterious social force which holds a people together in one solid mass in which all the superficial multiplicities and diversities are overwhelmed by a fundamental homogeneity. This force, at once so unifying and so divisive, the source of union and of war, is none other than the elusive sentiment much extolled by chauvinists and much condemned by pacifists which we call patriotism.

III. OPERATIONS AND EFFECTS OF PATRIOTISM

This is, like nationality, not readily definable. It signifies loyalty to one's nation and implies the obligation to serve and defend it. It is thus a passion which all normal men feel, and which in time of our country's peril commands our instant loyalty. Of all the emotions that move men to action it is the most capacious. When it is aroused there is no other social force comparable to it in the completeness with which it dominates all other springs of action in all sorts and conditions of men. It lifts the average man up out of the concerns of a work-a-day world into the noblest spirit of devotion; it quickens the pulse of the sluggard, reforms the wayward, forces generosity from the stingy, arouses the plodder to dreams of heroic deeds, gives courage to the cowardly, and makes the hearts of the shrewd and crafty wolves of society swell with an ostensible love of country. In its face local feuds are forgotten; the bitter struggles of parties and classes are submerged; differences of creed, of social status, and even of race are obliterated. Under these circumstances only the group leaders may speak. The citizen must offer himself in silence as a willing sacrifice on the altar of his country in whatever manner those in authority may dictate. Even honest criticism is anathema; the conscientious objector, who in times of peace is praised as a courageous man who dares to stand against the world for what he believes right, is denounced as a sneaking coward and herded into prison. The individual rights of free speech, press, and assembly so essential to democratic government, so zealously guarded during peace, and so boastfully displayed to an admiring world on the national holidays, not only cease to exist but are even denounced and proscribed as inimical to the public safety. The noble sentiments of toleration are fiercely denounced, as is also individual variation from type which is vigorously defended during peace under the ideals of individual liberty and initiative. Every social institution is brought into line; all organs of public opinion send forth a constant stream of uniform suggestions; the appeal is made

through church and lodge and every customary association, until the members of the social group coalesce into a solid sociality that surpasses the fondest imaginings of the utopian Socialist.

It is not unnatural that such a titanic social force should stir a man's emotional nature to its depths and especially during war, for war hallows every cause. At such times patriotism, like a resistless and mysterious genius, fills the entire fabric of society with its magical power. Few individuals escape its enchantment, and almost no one dares brook its hostility. While it ennobles the soul with the sublime spirit of self-sacrifice, it compels men to dilute the honesty of their thoughts; makes cowards of all but the most stalwart souls by forcing them to substitute the worse for the better reason and the lower ideal for one they feel to be higher. A bad citizen may thus be a good patriot, while George Washington and Samuel Adams, James Otis and Patrick Henry show us that good citizens may be very indifferent patriots. Under its guise every sort of sinister human purpose thrives, for anything which can be made to appear patriotic is instantly and deeply approved. To encounter a suspicion of lack of patriotism creates a greater defilement than the violation of an ancient taboo. As in the days of witchcraft suspects are whipped, tarred, and feathered or hanged, or like the distinguished list in "Who's Who in Pacifism and Radicalism," are immolated on the altar of militarism amid the shouts of the mob and the secret glee of the patriots who find the established social system the best of all possible systems. In other words, patriotism gives full sway to fear, unbridles the lusts and brutalities of savage man, intensifies our innate suggestibility, and subordinates the mind to every sort of delusion and deceit. Unfortunately there is no printed guide for the proper conduct of human affairs, and so deep is the mystery of social processes that only the ignorant and the simple have complete confidence in their solutions of social problems. In times of stress therefore the social mind finds refuge in those torrents of instinctive emotion which arise from the deepest recesses of human

nature and which propel the social group like a rudderless vessel before an ocean storm. Patriotism makes of national thought "not a cerebation but a contagion, not an activity but an epidemic."

It is a truism that patriotism effectually blinds the zealous patriots of each country to those faults which are so plain to the patriots of an enemy country. Indeed, one of the most common bits of sorcery accomplished by the spirit of patriotism is the subversion of conscience and the setting up of a special and higher moral code to which the demonized patriot swears allegiance in the truly obscurantist aphorism, "My country, right or wrong."

All patriotisms are supported largely by mystical and mythical elements and cannot be sustained without them. The Germans nursed their national egotism on doctrines of the mission of the Hohenzollerns to restore the ancient glories of the Holy Empire; the divine destiny of the German people to spread their culture throughout the world; the political incapacity of the French in contrast with their own innate political sagacity; the physical deterioration of the English in contrast to the racial efflorescence of themselves; and the governmental inefficiency and military clumsiness of the American democracy in contrast to their own efficiency and precision due to a peculiar Teutonic gift for organization. But let us not suppose that Germany is alone in the delusions and excesses of patriotic intoxication. The one great social utility of the sentiment of patriotism is to stimulate those group activities which relate to rivalry with other groups, to arouse the martial spirit, and to sustain the fighting edge of the group will. It specializes therefore in everything that will inflate the national ego. Like the Indians who aroused the necessary courage, procured the necessary suffusion of wonder-working mana, by means of the war-dance, so every nation belittles and caricatures its rivals and indulges in prodigious self-praise. According to the American press the Germans were for many months before the end of the war lacking in valor and fighting spirit and were being captured and killed by the millions, while the Americans greatly exceeded the

enemy in valor and love of battle, were seldom killed, and often a few of them would capture an amazing number of Germans. The enemy also were mostly boys and were starving besides, and yet the brave boys in khaki were all heroes and giant killers. The national ardor in every country was fed by most excruciating tales of fiendish cruelty and wanton destruction by the enemy, and no tale was too preposterous to be believed. In the recent war every nation conceived its cause to be just. In all of them precisely the same appeals to national tradition, love of country, and the ideals of truth, justice, and liberty were made to arouse and sustain the sharp edge of the fighting spirit. Words which in the mouths of our own orators aroused in us an afflatus of soul, would, when used by the enemy, as *Gott mit uns*, arouse only scorn and derision. Neither opponent could understand why the other was willing to fight for such low and sinister motives as were imputed to it, while each felt certain that it was fighting not merely for its own honor and glory but for the security and welfare of civilization. We Americans cannot ignore the fact that we have been moved by the doctrine of Manifest Destiny; that though a hybrid mixture of unsurpassed complexity, we cherish the myth of the Anglo-Saxon mission; nor that each and every one of us is deeply conscious of a desire to spread American institutions right round the earth. This is all natural and inevitable; but in this very consciousness is the problem of the world, for every aspiring nationality throbs with the same impulse to live and grow and prove its supremacy in the conflicts of life.

IV. ORIGIN AND FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE PATRIOTIC IMPULSE

Whence comes this superhuman force? It is as deep and mysterious as life itself and can be explained only in the light of that evolutionary process from which all creation springs. Indeed, of all the enigmas of nature, man himself is the most perplexing. The complexity and versatility of his capacities make him an object of wonder and of

mystery even to himself. That view of him which conceived his conduct as guided by the beacon light of pure reason and hence as seeking with a mathematical certainty the maximum of utility with the least of effort was simple indeed. On the other hand, the efforts for sociological purposes to subsume the basic elements of his nature under the three major instincts of self-preservation, love, and hunger have not proved satisfactory; for it is repeatedly observed that, at least in times of social crisis, the individual will subordinate all his self-regarding instincts to perform acts of supreme self-sacrifice in the interests of his group. He clings to life with utmost tenacity, and yet when aroused by the thousand and one subtle appeals to his social instinct he freely and with every appearance of consummate pleasure lays down his life for his country. Man, is thus, far from that coldly calculating rational creature of the early utilitarians and the classical economists; he is above all a social animal with a vast reservoir of group sentiments deposited during the age-long struggle for survival.

Man is in fact fundamentally gregarious by nature. He has never lived in isolation but always in groups. Lacking special organs of defense man found strength, as did the herd and the pack, in group solidarity. Consequently the struggle for existence on the human plane has been fundamentally a struggle of group with group. Since, then, his survival turned largely on the perfection of his gregarious instinct, there has been achieved in man a keen sensitiveness to the call of the group. This herd instinct, as Trotter calls it, is, therefore, the very basis of human society and the most profound aspect of man's social nature. It is for the group what the instinct of self-preservation is for the individual. It is aroused only in times of stress and danger; group fear in some form is essential to its development; when awakened it not only grips every tribesman in an atmosphere of electrified suggestibility, but stirs within his bodily mechanism the internal secretory apparatus whose products are essential to deeds of valor. It is in its strength and vigor an assertion of the group will to live, and is therefore as deep

and mysterious and indeed as permanent as the eternal nîsus of nature, the insistent push of everything that throbs with life and energy.

Patriotism is best conceived as rooted in that age-long struggle which Grumplowicz called *Der Rassenkampf*. It is at once the most profound and the most elemental manifestation of the gregarious instinct. Thus viewed its tremendous power, its contradictory effects, its lack of cold rationality, its heroisms, and its insane brutalities are all readily explainable. We thus find a common substratum for the war-like proclivities of primitive horde and tribe, medieval city and principality, and the modern nation and empire. We see why it is that in every group, primitive or civilized, ancient or modern, large or small, Scottish clan or British Empire, there is an instinctive loyalty to all that is related to or symbolic of the group life; and we see why all such objects pass through a process of idealization, so that in the end even the most sordid material advantages of the group are fought for in the name of liberty and humanity. Even divine justice and the will of God become synonymous with the needs and aspirations of the group. Among primitive peoples the most conspicuous objects of loyalty were kings, who because of their supposed divinity became the embodiment of all that was precious in the group life; and the preservation of dynastic prestige thus became through countless centuries the first object of every patriot's devotion. Modern democracy rejects the divine right of kings but holds with instinctive tenacity to the divine right of the state to sovereign self-determination, while among democratic peoples living in a capitalistic age almost equally precious objects of group solicitude are trade rights and opportunities. Viewing patriotism as an instinctive manifestation of the group will to live, we see why national honor holds such a vital place in international relations. Any surrender of acquired privilege, as in the Panama Canal tolls case, is accomplished only after a severe wrench to the national instinct of self-assertion; every compromise at the peace conference constituted an affront to national prestige and in the view of the thorough

patriot tarnished the shining shield of his nation's honor. Indeed the sense of national honor is at bottom simply another name for the deep emotional reaction of the social group toward anything which affects its egotism, its longing for prestige.

This view of patriotism makes clear the meaning of the statement that "without patriotism war would be inconceivable today." It is "a spirit of particularism;" it is clearly out of harmony with the civilization of all Christendom, based as this is on a science and scholarship that are, as Professor Veblen says, "homogeneously cosmopolitan," an industrial technique that is international, and political and esthetic cultures that transcend mountains and oceans. Yet the patriotic animus still lives on; it seems as intense today as in the centuries past; being an emotional manifestation of the herd instinct, it does not have to be learned, while the objects to which it is attached and the symbols and shibboleths which arouse it are solely matters of group tradition; it may be as ferocious or as generous in the mind of the child as in that of the most learned scientist.

Nothing could reveal more clearly the elemental nature, the instinctive character, of patriotism. At the very basis of the problem of permanent peace is, therefore, the question of how to manipulate or control this million-year old propensity. Man is a fighting animal; and it is much to his credit that he has been, for otherwise he would never have held his own in the merciless struggle for existence. It seems clearly established that the common progenitor of man and the higher anthropoids was not a fragile, shrinking tree-shrew, but a large, brutish creature with a well-developed fighting instinct. Man throughout his history has shown himself brave and heroic. The historical races have, during their prime, been bold and aggressive and have not shrunk from inflicting pain and death on those with whom they came in contact. Every great nation has glorified war, apotheosized its great military leaders, and endowed its soldiery with immortal bliss within the gates of Valhalla. You may think this an unfortunate picture of human nature and, of course it is not the whole

story, but I think we must accept it as true so far as it goes. For, I do not believe that a timid, sympathetic, highly altruistic creature would have succeeded in spreading himself over the entire globe in the face of ferocious beasts and in spite of wind and tide, desert and mountain. But of course, it must be added that no other animal has carried on so consistently a war of extermination against its own kind. It is no idle whim which led Madison Grant to find in the European War a symbol of "The Passing of The Great Race," the Nordic blondes of the Baltic basin, who as Franks gave their name to France, as Angles gave their name to England and as Germans gave their name to Germany. The conquering spirit which led these nations to spread their culture throughout the world found a tragic nemesis in pitting them against each other in a long death struggle.

V. THE OBJECTS AND SCOPE OF PATRIOTIC ATTACHMENT CHANGE

But if the patriotic animus be detrimental to the future of our civilization, is there no escape from the enchanting clutch of its magical power? If our thesis has been correct, there is an escape, but it can be accomplished only by the transfer of our supreme loyalty from nationalism to civilization, from country to humanity. We each and all retain a hierarchy of loyalties. We wish to see our voting precinct or our ward shine by comparison with others, but we forget these local attachments when there is a contest between our city and another. Each has a warm spot in his heart for his commonwealth, or for his section of the country when one is contrasted with another, but these are as nothing compared to love of country when she faces the foe. Now, all of these local sentiments are relatively weak and feeble, amounting only to a certain pleasure in local prestige and a moderate willingness to serve local ends. All are far from that flaming sentiment which, rooted in the group struggle for existence, elicits from us devotion unto death for the group and the ideals to which supreme loyalty is attached.

This complete self-abnegation, this triumphant consecration, reveals the true nature of patriotism. Consequently, in spite of all the absurdities we have noted in its manifestations, it is the noblest of sentiments. It is the negation of selfishness, the essence of altruism, and needs only a proper setting to make it the secure basis for a religion of humanity.

We all agree that for one city or commonwealth to take up arms against another over trade privileges would today be a gross absurdity; but American history had its Hartford Convention, its Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, its South Carolina rebellion, and its Civil War. In fact the development of every modern nation is a history of the gradual transfer of supreme loyalty from local groups to more inclusive ones. What was at one time a hundred fighting principalities each burning with racial egotism and martial zeal, are reformed by military power and economic interests into a dozen, and these dozen in the course of time coalesce into a great nation. What has been the secret of this transformation?

In the past, conquest has been a chief factor, as is shown by the history of modern European states and America. But conquest itself does not create new loyalty in the hearts of the conquered and may even sanctify an ancient allegiance. Our own South was not made loyal by defeat and the iron heel of the conqueror. And yet by the close of the century her sons marched side by side with those of the North in the war with Spain. This new patriotism of the South was the silent work of years of security within the common country and of an increasing economic solidarity. So long as contiguous nationalities seek to dominate and exploit each other, so long will local patriotisms flourish and bring forth their inevitable travail. For patriotism is race fear and will transmute itself into a higher loyalty only with the development of a sense of security and of economic solidarity within the larger social unit.

VI. PERMANENT PEACE MUST BE BASED ON A GENUINE INTERNATIONALISM

1. Its material conditions

In order, therefore, to advance the cause of international peace it seems necessary to achieve two fundamental things. In the first place, the material interests of the great nations must be brought more and more into harmony. So recent has been the development of national unity and so persistently have all nations thought of themselves as economically and politically independent that we have developed no basis for the psychology of internationalism.

Nevertheless we are apparently at a point in the development of the Western World in which the material basis of internationalism is developing rapidly. The writings of Norman Angel in the "Great Illusion" and "The Fruits of Victory" have presented this aspect of affairs most cogently. The war itself was a prodigious demonstration that every great industrial nation must inevitably lose more by modern war than it can ever hope to gain thereby. In other words, as has been frequently pointed out, Europe has become an economic unity. While the nations are still politically independent they have become economically interdependent. The war demonstrated that none of them is able to maintain the level of pre-war prosperity apart from the prosperity of its neighbors. The war has therefore prepared the way for a recognition of the fact that the material welfare of all Europe presents a unified problem: that whether they like it or not, friend and foe grow rich or poor together.

Moreover, the war produced a condition which is rapidly precipitating the Western World in the direction of international capitalism. During the 19th century the national capitalistic state with its accompanying imperialism and its system of protective tariffs was the dominating actor on the international stage. Several European countries had invested heavily in the Americas and many of them had invested largely outside of Europe, but, aside from French investments in Russia, none of them had a large stake in

the economic development of any other. But now Europe owes us not less than fifteen billion dollars, she owes England other billions, and other continental countries owe France still other billions of dollars. In the era that we are undoubtedly entering the investment of one great nation in another, the purchases of one nation in another, and the marketing of surplus products by one nation in another and the common investment of capital by the citizens of many countries in the same industrial ventures are becoming fundamentally important in the determination of national policy. Not only is the financial stake of the advanced countries in one another now a prodigious sum, but the national finances of numerous European nationalities are in such a precarious condition that only international assistance will enable them to recover their balance. In fact, we are faced with the bankruptcy of more than one national unit and such disorder in the finances of others, upon whose financial soundness the prosperity of the great industrial powers so intimately depends, that we may count on future conferences for the purpose of setting the international financial mechanism in running order. It is much as it was among the American colonies after the Revolution, during what is known as the Critical Period. There was a state of financial chaos, of trade restriction, tariff warfare, and local jealousy which led all the far-seeing minds of the era to realize the necessity of the formation of a more perfect union for the promotion of the common welfare.

In addition there are two other tendencies worth noting. One of these is the tendency of the capitalistic interests of different countries but engaged in the same industry to enter into world combines. This had begun before the war in steel, tobacco, oil and shipping, and may be expected to take on a new development just as soon as international relations are again established. And then there is the fact already recognized that the advanced industrial nations must jointly participate in the development of backward areas and the production of the raw materials of the machine industries. In other words, the rapid development of international capitalism, the beginnings of which we now

very clearly observe, will furnish an increasingly firm foundation for the development of the psychology of internationalism upon which the establishment of a real international depends.

2. Its psychological basis

But if we are to have a genuine internationalism it must be grounded in popular sentiment and imagination. Napoleon said that men are ruled by their imaginations and certainly all that one need to add is that men are ruled by their emotions and imaginations. On great problems of group interest men do not reason calmly and objectively, but start emotionally from certain great ultimates which have become so deeply implanted in their psychic life as to seem sacred and beyond question. This may be tribal totem, royal emblem, or nation's flag. Consequently, while it is true that nations aim to follow their self-interests in international relations, history has amply demonstrated that the bias of patriotic sentiment greatly warps the conception of what the self-interest truly is. From this standpoint of material welfare, purblind nationalism dictates policies of separatism and antagonism. Economically, Ireland is a province of Great Britain and dependent on the British market for its livelihood, but the Irish Free State is a necessary concession to the sentiment of Irish nationalism.

But I do not mean to belittle the importance of the essential material basis of internationalism; I put it first. America herself constitutes a great illustration. Our Union was preserved by war and conquest, but it did not become deeply implanted in the imagination and sentiment of the South for a full generation after the Civil War. Meanwhile, railroads had been built north and south, northern capital had pressed for investment in the South, and trade relations between the two sections had grown to extensive proportions. New political issues and a new generation then enabled the magic personality of Roosevelt to break the Solid South in the first decade of the Twentieth Century. The growth of economic interdependence is therefore an essential basis for the establishment of a psychic foundation

for unity of rival groups, and it is not likely that unity can progress much beyond limits set by material factors, as is illustrated by the present estrangement between France and England. But the establishment of a genuine internationalism which will put an end to war will not be assured until the ideal of a great inter-state is implanted in the popular consciousness as one of life's ultimate values.

Now nothing could reveal more clearly how far we are from the goal of permanent peace, for nationalism is still supreme in the popular mind. No doubt, immense service to peace is rendered by successful international conferences, such as that on disarmament. They create an atmosphere of mutual understanding and confidence which is inimical to the spirit of national provincialism under which patriotism thrives most intensely. International conferences of those nations among whom friction and conflict of interests were developing might well serve to prevent war, so long as they were successful. But their success is always endangered by the uncompromising spirit of national self-esteem and self-assertion. This prevents the national representatives from surrendering anything deemed important for the maintenance of national prestige or the further expansion of the national ego. France will not even permit a discussion at Genoa of questions of reparations and treaty revision which are clearly fundamental to the restoration of peace and prosperity in Europe. It is obvious that the world is not prepared for anything revolutionary and there is not in any country one single statesman with the vision, and at the same time a grip on the popular imagination, such as to enable him to lead European peoples rapidly toward a new international organization.

It does not seem probable, therefore, that one should confidently expect permanent peace to have been established until modern patriotisms have waned and have been transmuted into a similar and equally intense emotional attachment to the symbols of internationalism. Permanent peace will rest on secure foundation only when there has been a genuine inter-state to which the sovereignty of separatist nationalities is subordinated through its ultimate

power to compel obedience. Meanwhile, nations must have grown immensely more interdependent, their mutual interests must have devised a multiplicity of new institutions of international coöperation, they must have repeatedly signified their willingness to accommodate their minor self-interests to their larger and permanent ones by mutual compromise, and they must at the same time have developed a much greater attachment to those symbols of internationalism which must displace the symbols of nationalism. If we look forward seriously to the development of the international mind, then we must set seriously to work to transmute the powerful sentiment of national patriotism into an automatic and ultimate regulator of popular emotions and imaginations by a new set of symbols and a new and stirring ritual to arouse the deep-seated instincts and emotions of man to unquestioned devotion to the cause of humanity rather than the cause of tribe or nation.